	Case 2:06-cv-01655-JLR Document 2	2 Filed 11/28/06	Page 1 of 3
01	1		
02			
03			
04			
05			
06			
07			
08	8		
09	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
10	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE		
11	PAUL C. CULLOM, JR., et al.,	ase No. C06-1655-	JLR-JPD
12	Plaintiffs,		
13			OMMENIO ATION
14	4	EPORT AND REC	OMMENDATION
15	CITY OF KENT, et al.,) Defendants.		
16	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
17	Plaintiffs, appearing pro se, recently filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis		
18	(IFP) in this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. Dkt. No. 1. Plaintiffs Paul C. Cullom, Jr., Rollin M.		
19	Perkins, Peter Friedman, Bank of America, "USAA," and "one Black Rubber Boot Named		
20	'Boss,'" included with their application a one-and-a-half page "Semper Fidelis Complaint Pro		
21	Se" naming no less than twenty-five defendants including, for example, the City of Kent, Bank		
22	of America, Bill Gates, and King County Prosecuting Attorney Norm Maleng. Dkt. No. 1-2.		
23	Styled a "Hate Crime Conspiracy," plaintiffs' complaint asserts, without more, that "[t]he		
24	defendants, acting under color of state law, have violated my civil rights and my constitutional		
25	rights." Id. Damages are measured at "\$1 million, at least." Dkt. No. 1-3.		
26	6		
	REPORT & RECOMMENDATION PAGE - 1		

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), this Court may deny an application to proceed IFP and should dismiss an action if, among other things, it is frivolous or the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i)-(ii); *O'Loughlin v. Doe*, 920 F.2d 614, 616 (9th Cir. 1990). An action is frivolous if "it lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact." *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989).

Here, plaintiffs fail to allege any facts to place defendants on notice of the nature of their claims or to otherwise provide any basis for jurisdiction in this Court. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). The complaint also appears to name as defendants governmental actors who enjoy immunity from suit. *See*, *e.g.*, *Imbler v. Pachtman*, 424 U.S. 409, 427 (1976); *Pierson v. Ray*, 386 U.S. 547, 553-54 (1967). Because this action appears frivolous and fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, it is subject to dismissal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6).

The Court advises plaintiffs of their responsibility to research the facts and law before filing a complaint in order to determine whether their claim for relief is frivolous. If plaintiffs file a frivolous action, they may be sanctioned. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 11. The court would likely impose a sanction of dismissal on any frivolous complaint. If plaintiffs file numerous frivolous or malicious complaints, the court may bar them from proceeding IFP in this court. *See DeLong v. Hennessey*, 912 F.2d 1144, 1146-48 (9th Cir. 1990) (discussing bar order requirements).¹

¹ The Court notes that plaintiff Cullom is a prolific litigator who has filed four similar lawsuits in as many months against various private citizens, governmental officers and attorneys in this district. *See, e.g., Cullom et al. v. Doe et al.*, C06-957-JCC; *Cullom et al. v. Gates et al.*, C06-1564-RSM; *Cullom et al. v. Gates et al.*, C06-1573-MJP; *Cullom et al. v. City of Kent et al.*, C06-1655-JLR. Indeed, a strikingly similar action previously filed by plaintiff in this district was dismissed on grounds similar to those recommended by the Court today. *See Cullom*, C06-957-JCC, Dkt. No. 15 (dismissing case for failure to comply with court's order to show cause and failure to meet the requirements of Rule 8).

Because of the extreme deficiencies in plaintiffs' IFP application and complaint, their request to proceed IFP should be DENIED and this action DISMISSED without prejudice. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). A proposed Order of Dismissal accompanies this Report and Recommendation. If plaintiffs believe that the deficiencies outlined herein can be cured by an amendment to their complaint, they should lodge an amended complaint as a part of their objections, if any, to this Report and Recommendation. DATED this 28th day of November, 2006. mer P. Donoaue AMES P. DONOHUE United States Magistrate Judge

REPORT & RECOMMENDATION PAGE - 3